

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

MAR 24 1942

Volume II, No. 4

March 23, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Democracy in Color

WHEN Pearl Buck spoke at the Book and Author luncheon in New York on February 10 about race prejudice in relation to the war she uttered words of scorching truth. "If," she said, "we intend to persist blindly in our racial prejudices, then we are fighting on the wrong side in this war. We belong with Hitler." If there ever was a turn of history that cast a nation in an ironic role the present generation of Americans is witnessing it.

This journal has made its total support of the American cause unmistakably clear. We see issues involved that concern the future of mankind for centuries to come. This surely gives us the right to point out evils within the nation that jeopardize victory for the cause of human freedom. It is hardly too much to say that our gravest danger is not a fifth column composed of sympathizers with the enemy but a grim impersonal monster that devours democracy in its own house. It is the very same demon of racism that we so vigorously condemn in the Nazi creed.

It is bitter irony that in a just effort to restrain a mad imperialist venture on the part of Japan we should become the targets of a peculiarly potent Japanese propaganda—potent because of the truth it contains—by which Japan is seeking to persuade our Chinese allies that they can hope for no equal treatment from a nation that represses its own colored people. "Look at the Americans," Mrs. Buck assures us Japan is saying to the Chinese, and not without effect, "will white Americans give you equality?"

The color issue is not a sectional question in America. It can be forcefully argued that the only difference between the North and the South in this respect is accounted for by relative numbers. It is not in the South but in New York's Harlem that a great community of 300,000 souls stands as a monument to economic and political exploitation. Qualitatively, our color prejudice is not a sectional but a national disease.

Ironical, too, may seem the fact that it should be

necessary to implement an appeal for simple democratic decency by linking it with the fortunes of war. Yet to an ethical realist this should not be a strange alignment. It is of the essence of Christian philosophy as we understand it that humanity does not rise majestically on the wings of its own moral aspiration. Always the upward lift of the spirit is linked with the struggle of the flesh for survival. This is why a justifiable war is always in some sense a coincidence of power to survive with the custodianship of values that are worth surviving for, and the morally authentic quality of human life gains its ultimate attestation in the possibility of effecting such a coincidence in the affairs of men and nations. Hence it is right and necessary that the effort to remedy a deep and persistent national fault should be reinforced by a recognition of its close relationship to the effective exercise of national power. Miss Buck's appeal is more than an *argumentum ad hominem*: it has an unmistakably authentic quality.

This is the same truth that the recent depression forced upon the nation in the economic sphere. The cry of exploited millions was not in itself enough to overcome greed and complacency on the part of the more privileged. But when it was seen that no part of the population could continue to be prosperous while millions were unable to buy the goods they needed, the claims of moral decency were implemented by economic necessity. Perhaps the deepest lesson of this war will be that the "American way" as it is can never be wholly convincing to those oriental peoples on whose friendship American policy depends.

And let those who remain unimpressed with the necessity of revolutionizing their own racial attitudes reflect on the fact that Russia, whose associate in a mortal combat we have now become and whose future influence our conservatives greatly fear, has won no small measure of her power by dealing effectually with race prejudice. Continued blinding of our eyes is not only a crime; it is a historical blunder.

But more grievous than the sin of the nation is the sin of the Church. For the Church enjoys immunity from the crude competitive forces that impose a lag upon economic and political progress. The Church professes to be a fellowship of grace, testifying to a universal gospel which knows no barriers of race or color. How anomalous is our situation. How hollow the shibboleths of ecumenism in a Church that not only condones segregation but practices it complacently. There are not lacking in the Christian community earnest men and women who are questioning the survival value of the Church as it is today. It is much too early to despair of it. We do not despair of it. But if in this crisis in history the Church cannot end segregation in its own corporate

life it will be hard to justify its claim, in the years ahead, to be an instrumentality of redemption.

This is not romanticism. It rests on no utopian assumptions as to what the existential Church can become. Its members can never escape the limitations of the human situation in which they are involved. Nor can they command their emotions and resolve their prejudices at will. None of us can become gentle and loving merely by willing to do so. But preserving or altering the general patterns of institutional behavior is a deliberate act. To end segregation in the Church requires only the will to create a situation in which the Christian fellowship can strengthen and vindicate itself.

E. J.

The Jewish Problem and Its Solution

EUGENE KOHN

THE tragic manifestations of the Jewish problem today are part of the modern crisis, and its solution must be one of the objectives of all people who would help mankind to a better life.

Democratic countries now realize how dangerous a weapon anti-Semitic propaganda can become against their national security. In every country exposed to the Nazi lust for dominion, anti-Semitism has been used as the entering wedge for a Fifth Column. By playing on the latent hostility of the mob against Jews, Nazi propaganda could direct against them and all who befriended them whatever discontent existed among the masses, regardless of its true cause. By making the Jews appear as the enemies of Western civilization and himself as the Messiah of the Gentiles, Hitler has stirred up dissension and revolt and diverted attention from his own designs against the peace of the world.

The use of anti-Semitism for evil ends that go beyond the mischief to the Jews themselves did not originate with Hitler, nor, in all likelihood, will Hitler be the last to employ it. In Czarist Russia, anti-Semitism was repeatedly used to head off impending revolution. Wherever anti-Semitism exists, progress is stifled by the easy device of ascribing all social evils to the Jews. Quite apart, therefore, from any desire to do justice to the Jews, the Christian world should, in its own interests, promote an equitable solution of the Jewish problem.

To well-meaning Christians who were hardly aware of the problem until the Nazi persecutions brought it home to them, it often presents itself in an oversimplified form. Anti-Semitism seems to them to be

merely part of the fantastic mythology of Nazism. Defeat Nazism—so they reason—re-establish the prestige of democracy, and the Jewish problem will disappear. Human rights will then be restored in all countries now subject to the Nazi dictatorship, including Germany itself, and the Jews will share in the restoration. They will again enjoy equality of opportunity and a chance to live in peace and honor.

Jewish Problem Oversimplified

The major error of this viewpoint lies in the assumption that a conflagration is due to the spark that starts it and not to the inflammable material to which the spark is applied. It seems to assume also that it is as easy to extinguish a blaze as to light it. The spectacular rise of Hitler to power in Germany was greatly facilitated by the ease with which he could exploit anti-Semitism: his entire program was possible only because the germ of Jew hatred was everywhere present. Hitler was only the spark that set fire to the ubiquitous antipathy toward the Jew, dormant where people were happy and contented, active where they were wretched and resentful. This antipathy preceded the rise of Hitler and will not disappear with his downfall. On the contrary, it is likely to be even more widespread and active than ever.

It is true, of course, that if, after the victory of the Allies, security and prosperity will prevail all over the world, with every man happily employed, a reaction against anti-Semitism might conceivably ensue. But whoever looks to the speedy realization

of that dream lives in a fool's paradise. We are witnessing the débâcle of a civilization, and although we may hope that a better civilization will eventually rise from its ruins, it will not come about over night. Before its consummation mankind will have to atone for its sins and follies by suffering the death struggle of the old order and the birth-pangs of the new. In such a world, it is unreasonable to expect the disappearance of anti-Semitism as the automatic consequence of a military victory.

The experience of the Jewish people after the First World War confirms this conclusion. At that time an earnest attempt was made to improve the status of the Jews in Europe. In the new states carved out by the post-war treaties, Jews were granted equality of civil, political and cultural rights. But this did not prevent acts of oppression and even pogroms in Poland, Rumania, and other countries. Can we expect that after the present war the spirit of hatred, persistently and relentlessly indoctrinated in a whole generation from its youth, will be exorcised by the spell of pious words written into diplomatic documents?

There is another view on the future of the Jewish people which, though less naïve than the supposition that a democratic victory will automatically solve the Jewish problem, is also inadequate. It looks for a solution to directed emigration of Jews from lands where they are persecuted.

Post-War Refugee Problem

All serious statesmen have come to realize that, when the war is over, the world will be left with a refugee problem of staggering dimensions. No matter how the map of Europe is redrawn, millions of people will find themselves in the status of alien and unwanted minorities in the midst of unfriendly majorities.

But the problem is unprecedented not only in magnitude but also because never before has a forced migration encountered so many barriers. The Evian Conference, called to enlist the aid of governments in solving the refugee problem, found itself frustrated by the unwillingness even of nations sympathetic with the plight of the refugees to admit them in their midst. They expressed fear of creating a minority problem where none existed. Doubtless, after the war, international cooperation may in some measure mitigate the lot of many refugees by resettling them, but it will not solve the Jewish problem.

The proposal for directed resettlement has this in its favor: it implies a realization that there can be no solution for the problem of the Jews where, as in Central Europe, anti-Semitism is endemic, except through emigration. That may be true as well of the problem of other minorities, and it may require an exchange of population like the one that took

place between Greece and Turkey after the First World War. But to treat the Jewish problem as part of the general refugee problem reveals a lack of realism. It fails to reckon with its uniqueness. Other minorities for whom life may be made miserable by majorities of different race, religion and culture, can find a place in which *their* race, religion and culture are dominant. When the war is over and the problem of resettling these minorities is taken up, they can be directed to where they will find a welcome among their own.

The Jew is not so fortunate. There is no country where his people constitute the majority; he is therefore always received with reservations and misgivings. He can never feel that, because today he is treated with decent tolerance, he may not tomorrow be exposed to the same hostility as the one from which he fled. In the Germany in which Lessing and Mendelssohn played chess and discussed philosophy, Jews had reason to believe they would continue to live in peace, but a new age has produced a new Germany.

National Home for Jews

The Jewish problem cannot be solved merely by rescuing individuals and helping them to find new homes where they may for a time live in peace. Such a policy overlooks the fact that anti-Semitism migrates with the Jews. A wider dispersion of the Jews leaves them not more but less able to defend themselves against a hostile majority. It is therefore not enough to help Jews out of those countries in which life is made intolerable for them; they must be given an opportunity to establish somewhere—Zionists say in Palestine—a national home where they would constitute the majority. To this homeland, a Jew from any part of the world would be able to migrate and be received as a son returning home, not as a fugitive given reluctant asylum by a host who is disturbed and annoyed by the necessity of harboring him.

The Balfour Declaration, issued by the British War Cabinet of 1917, is essentially a recognition of the validity of the homeland situation. The Declaration was endorsed by all the nations that made up the League. The Emir Feisal, later King of Iraq, who represented the Arabs in the peace negotiations, also recognized the claim of the Jewish people to a homeland in Palestine. The claim was finally given legal status in the Mandate over Palestine which was assigned to be administered under the authority of the League of Nations by Great Britain. In 1922 our own government endorsed the national home for the Jewish people in Palestine by a joint resolution of both houses of Congress. The American Palestine Committee, which was organized last April, is proof that in the past two decades the good will of the

American people and government has not diminished. That Committee numbers some 700 men and women who are outstanding in every walk of life, including 67 members of the United States Senate, 139 members of the House of Representatives, 22 governors of states, distinguished jurists, clergymen, publishers, editors, writers and civic leaders.

Relying on the guarantees furnished by the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, the Jews have established in Palestine the foundations of a National Home. The Jewish population has increased more than tenfold, from a little over 50,000 to 555,000. The progress in land reclamation, rural and urban colonization and industry is well summarized in the report of the Royal Commission, headed by Earl Peel, which investigated conditions in Palestine in 1936. Following are some brief excerpts from the Royal Commission report:

"Twelve years ago the National Home was an experiment; today it is a going concern. . . . The process of agricultural colonization has steadily continued. . . . Wide stretches of plain-land, drained and irrigated and green with citrus trees or brown from the plough, are now the agrarian basis of the National Home. The country-towns have likewise grown and prospered. . . . Yet more impressive has been the urban development. Tel Aviv, still a wholly Jewish town, has leaped to the first place among the towns of Palestine. . . . Broadly speaking, the remarkable urban development in Palestine has been Jewish. [Palestine Royal Commission Report, London, 1937; pp. 113-115.]

"The wide manufacturing field now covers extraction of mineral salts from the Dead Sea, food products, drinks, cigarettes, tobacco, building materials, metal-work, furniture, textiles, leather goods, artificial teeth, matches, wearing apparel, and chemical and allied products." [*Ibid.*, p. 209.]

But the right of the Jewish people to their national home in Palestine needs to be reaffirmed.

Nor have the Arabs in Palestine been injured by Jewish progress; they have, on the contrary, been substantially benefited by it. The strife that marred the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine for the three years before the outbreak of the war was due almost entirely to the incitation of Axis agents. In the absence of outside instigation, the Jews and Arabs have proved willing and able to live together in peace. As to the material benefits the Arabs have derived from Jewish enterprise in Palestine, the same Royal Commission says (p. 129):

"The large import of Jewish capital into Palestine has had a general fructifying effect on the economic life of the whole country. The expansion of Arab industry and citriculture has been

largely financed by the capital thus obtained. Jewish example has done much to improve Arab cultivation, especially of citrus. Owing to Jewish development and enterprise the employment of Arab labour has increased in urban areas, particularly in the ports. The reclamation and anti-malaria work undertaken in Jewish colonies have benefited all Arabs in the neighborhood. Institutions, founded with Jewish funds primarily to serve the National Home, have also served the Arab population. Hadassah for example, treats Arab patients, notably at the Tuberculosis Hospital at Safed and the Radiology Institute at Jerusalem, admits Arab country-folk to the clinics of its Rural Sick Benefit Fund, and does much infant welfare work for Arab mothers. The general beneficent effect of Jewish immigration on Arab welfare is illustrated by the fact that the increase in the Arab population is most marked in urban areas effected by Jewish development."

Present British Policy

In recent years, the British government, in the hope of appeasing the Arab extremists, has in effect repudiated its mandatory obligation to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home. It has arbitrarily restricted Jewish immigration and the sale of land to Jews with the aim of keeping the Jews a permanent minority in Palestine. This policy of appeasement has proved itself no less pathetic and futile in Palestine than anywhere else in the world. It has not brought England the active loyalty of the Arab communities of the Near East as it was designed to do. The assumption that those communities—Syria, Egypt, Iraq, The Hadjaz, Transjordan and the others—were deeply disturbed by the prospect of a Jewish National Home in Palestine and would be appeased by its abandonment has shown itself to be false. The attitude of those communities in Britain's hour of need has ranged from indifference to open rebellion. In fact, it was only in the Palestine Jewish community that the British cause has found eager co-operation—too eager for some British officials. The offer of that community to place several divisions on the fighting fronts has not yet been accepted. Only some 10,000 Jewish volunteers have so far been permitted to serve, and most of them in non-combatant units.

The question has often been raised: In view of the complications in Palestine, would not some other region be more desirable for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth? Even among Jews the suggestion of another territory is sometimes heard.

Significance of Palestine to Jews

The Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate are based on the recognition of the historical

connection of Palestine with the Jewish people. The choice of Palestine was not arbitrary. For no other people in the modern world has Palestine ever been a national home. Arabic culture did not originate in Palestine nor has it ever flourished there as it once did in Cairo, Bagdad or Cordova. There was no Palestine Arab nation nor Palestine Arab nationalism in the country when the Balfour Declaration was issued. There were Arabs who had been living in the land under the Turkish regime, but they were not hostile to the Jews nor ambitious for the establishment of an Arab state. In fact, Palestine as a geographic or historic unit, did not exist for them; they thought of it merely as a part of Syria. The Jews, on the other hand, from the time of the destruction of the Judean state, have always longed for their homeland and prayed for its restoration. Palestine is the only land which Jews can claim, on historical grounds, as their national home, and the Jews are the only people who have made Palestine a historic and geographic entity.

Those who propose to substitute this or that undeveloped region in South America, Africa, Alaska, or elsewhere have a peculiar conception of what is involved in nation-building. They seem to look upon human beings as mere figures in population statistics and would solve the refugee problem by taking out pins, symbolic of statistical units, from one place on a map and sticking them into another. They seem to ignore the toil and sweat, the disappointments and frustrations, the nostalgia and heartaches that accompany all colonizing enterprises. The Jewish pioneers are willing to pay that price if it means the fulfilment of the dream of a regenerated national life on the land associated with all their sacred memories. But to expect them to make such sacrifices for a land that is strange to them, and that might mean but another station in their wanderings, is asking too much. Under the lash of persecution and imminent danger, Jews may take up residence in any primitive territory, but they will, the moment an opportunity is afforded, seek some more civilized abode in the wide-flung Jewish diaspora. Only in Palestine can the Jew, who has been alienated from the soil for so many centuries, thrill to the task of building again his civilization literally from the ground up. This is not mere theory. A comparison of the results of Jewish colonization efforts in Argentina and in Palestine bears out its truth.

But is Palestine large enough to absorb all the Jews who need to seek new homes? The question cannot be answered categorically. The absorptive capacity of a country is not a fixed quantity: it varies with the changes in its degree of development. It has been estimated by eminent authorities that Palestine could absorb many times its present Jewish population of

about half a million. At any rate, its capacity has by no means been exhausted. When the population of Palestine begins approaching the limit of its economic absorptive capacity, it may be time to think of other territories for Jewish settlement.

A victory for the forces of freedom should, by every calculation, take the edge off the problem of Europe's minorities. Whether the relief comes as a result of the interchange of populations, the implementation of minority rights, the establishment of civil, political and religious equality or the general mitigation of the extremes of nationalism, there is good ground for the hope that the seething cauldron of Europe's nationalities will sooner or later come down to a simmer and that the states among themselves, as well as the different groups within each state, will establish a *modus vivendi* that will make civilized life possible. From such a *modus*, every group, except those that are animated by predatory designs, stands to gain, and the Jewish group more than any other. For, not even the most optimistic advocate of the Jewish National Home will contend that Palestine could or should harbor all the Jews of Europe. Mankind will not adopt the principle of water-tight segregation of nationalities, and the attempt to do so would be a moral disaster. There will be Jewish communities in every land of Europe even after Palestine has provided a habitation and a name for the Jewish people as a whole, and the right of Jews to live as citizens of other lands will no more be subject to question than the right of any other people to the same status. The gates of the National Home will be open to all Jews for whom life in other lands has become intolerable but in all lands there will continue to dwell Jewish minorities, their moral status enhanced by the very existence of the National Home, and their social status confirmed by the recognition of their basic human rights.

An experience of over 2,000 years ought to count for something in a policy or program of action. For nearly 2,000 years, all the Jews of the world have lived in minority status. They have seen other ethnic and cultural groups also in the position of minorities, but somewhere the kith and kin of those groups enjoyed the status of majorities. The Jews alone could turn to no such place on the face of the earth. Now they ask for the right to establish such a place. To it they will come from those lands where their presence in large numbers exposes them to hostility and danger, and life will become more tolerable for those of them that choose to stay behind. And, in the countries they leave, the effort to establish the principles of human equality will have a far greater chance to succeed if the passions of the mob and the designs of the demagogues are deprived of their pet objective.

A False Christian Nationalism

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY has published a series of editorials which develop a distinctive point of view about the war, a point of view with which we are in the sharpest disagreement. We recognize that *The Christian Century* has made an honest and, in many respects, a fresh attempt to see this war from a Christian perspective. We welcome the fact that it has sought to avoid the conventional support of war and the idealization of the nation's cause which marked the record of the Churches in the First World War. *The Christian Century* has described with unusual insight man's plight in being confronted by tragic necessities which make a good choice in some situations impossible. It has not echoed the fallacies of the perfectionist moralists in our midst. But its own fallacies are no less disastrous.

According to *The Christian Century* this war is the judgment of God upon all nations for their past sins. There are, for it, no universal issues involved in the war which make it possible to say that it is a just war. If we support our government in its war effort, as *The Christian Century* does support it, the only reason given for so doing is that our nation has been attacked and we should not in its time of crisis put our private moral judgment above the will of our community. It maintains that we should fight as a tragic necessity and not because God wills that we seek to defeat the Axis powers. This tragic necessity is not in itself sinful. It is "Hell" in a precise sense of the word, a punishment upon our past sins. While we are in the midst of this "Hell" moral categories no longer apply to our conduct in relation to the prosecution of the war. It seems quite clear to *The Christian Century* that war is to be isolated from all other forms of human evil and apparently the outcome of the war is a matter of moral indifference. Its only reason for desiring an American victory is that as Americans we want our nation to be spared the suffering and loss that defeat might bring to us.

The most obvious fallacy in this analysis is the isolation of war as the only evil that is to be called "Hell." Suppose that we were to find that an Axis victory meant a situation in which the moral choices of men are as limited as in war and in which there is much less hope of something better. Would it not then prove to have been a moral obligation to act within this "Hell" so as to secure an Axis defeat and thus prevent the development of the new and worse form of "Hell," a world-wide tyranny? It is our understanding of the facts that underlie this war that we face exactly that kind of situation. It does make a moral difference whether or not the Axis powers

win the war. The weakness of the argument of *The Christian Century* is revealed in one statement in which it is said that American pacifists desire a victory for their country. Does *The Christian Century* seriously think that this is merely because it is *their* country and not because they do see universal values at stake in the struggle even though they may be doubtful about the method of war? We can put beside this fact that most pacifists in this country do not want to see an Axis victory the fact that many patriotic Germans and Italians and some patriotic Japanese believe that the only hope for their nations is in military defeat. We distrust idealizations of war as much as *The Christian Century* but we cannot escape the conviction that this war, as a great German who desires the defeat of Germany has put it, is a civil war of humanity.

Obviously *The Christian Century's* position is essentially nationalistic. It says that our national independence is at stake. Surely if we are that much threatened, it is not stretching the facts to say that the independence of most of the nations is at stake also. This is true of all conquered nations. It is also true of China and Russia and the British Commonwealth. It is even true of the people of Germany, Japan and Italy. Is this a small matter? Should a Christian journal be exercised only about our own independence in the midst of such a world struggle? One aspect of this nationalistic bias is that *The Christian Century* is unable to see this war as one war. The war in the Pacific is our war because we were attacked but the war in Europe seems to belong to a different category. But is it credible that our independence would be seriously threatened if the only enemy were Japan? Japan is a threat to us because the whole world is already threatened by the power of the Axis as a whole.

So narrow has been the basis given for support of this war by *The Christian Century* that we are sure that many of those interested in *Christianity and Crisis* would take up the position of the conscientious objectors if they were limited to its arguments. To maintain a witness against war may well be our highest obligation if there is no evil more devastating than war, which victory in war is the only means of preventing. The citizens of Germany, Italy and Japan could use the argument of *The Christian Century* as well as our citizens for the support of their government. To say that God visits us with the necessity of such meaningless killing as a punishment for our sins is to undermine the righteousness of God far more than is the case if we say that the defeat of the Axis at the moral cost of war is in line with His will.

It is not enough to answer that such universal issues of freedom and justice have not been the primary "motivation of our belligerency." It is quite

true that we did not become a belligerent until we were attacked. But that fact does not alter the objective situation, quite independent of our motivation, that our victory would mean the end of slavery or of the threat of slavery for many nations. Nor is it enough to argue that Christians have been wrong in the past in finding universal issues at stake in their wars. That fact suggests caution as we make moral judgments about this war but it by no means rules out the possibility that our cause in this war is just, not in the sense that we and our allies have a con-

sistent record of justice but in the sense that we are the only instruments available for overcoming a form of power that is monstrously unjust and which lacks the means of self-criticism and self-correction which keep our forms of injustice from being enemies of hope.

A Christian approach to the war which takes refuge in a tepid nationalism, lays the foundations for another renunciation of international responsibilities after the war. In that case our last estate would be worse than the first.

J. B.

The World Church: News and Notes

Student War Relief

Money for student war relief is raised in the United States by the World Student Service Fund (8 West 40th St., New York City). This organization has been responsible for securing a total of \$151,000 in the last four years. The goal this year is for \$100,000, half to go to Europe and half to China. Much of the money comes from the colleges, 324 of which contributed to the World Student Service Fund last year.

The European Student Relief Fund does a remarkable piece of work among students in prisoner-of-war camps where the problem is essentially one of morale. Food, clothing, shelter, medical care are provided by the detaining power. What is needed therefore is something to fill the endless hours of captivity—books, musical instruments, phonograph records, and equipment for sports. Books have been the most significant items sent into the camps, both in number (more than 4500 to camps in Germany last year) and in effect. With the incentive they provided classes have been organized and in time a complete curriculum set up. The "universities of captivity" have done such a notable quality of work that British universities have agreed to accept some of it in preparation for a degree.

The work is carried on in prison camps not only in Germany but in Great Britain, Canada, Ceylon, and Australia, and in internment camps in these countries as well as Switzerland and unoccupied France. Work among refugee students, both in Europe and in the United States, is another phase of this program.

In China the nature of student relief is wholly different. Here the problem is one of enabling the tiny number of college students—only one in 10,000 of the population—to remain at study despite bombed and transplanted universities, the loss of financial support from families, and the alarming rise in the cost of living. The National Student Relief Committee with headquarters in Chengtu finds that it must use one-third of the funds at its disposal for grants for food. Other important items of relief are: medical care, clothing, travel aid, lodging, books and supplies.

Recent cables from China indicate that universities in Shanghai, Hongkong and Peiping have been closed since

December 7th, and this is meaning the dislocation and destitution of thousands more students.

Swedish Bishops Ask Aid for Norway

A letter from the Bishops of the Swedish Church was read from all pulpits in Sweden on Sunday, February 15th, in connection with the beginning of the Lenten season. It stated in part:

"The miseries through which the whole world is passing today are indescribable. At this time our thoughts go to our northern neighbors. Our Norwegian brother-people are suffering severely under oppression and inner dissension. We see with deep distress and pain that the judicial systems, on which all freedom is in reality built, are shaken in their foundations. With force and with faith in God the Norwegian Church is fighting for the right of the Christian conscience and for the inviolability of the spiritual freedom. There is no doubt but that it is our duty to help our brethren to the utmost of our ability, but above all we must not forget now to remember our northern brother-people in our prayers. They must know that we regard their distress as our own."

Resistance in Norway

The Nazi journal, *Aftenposten*, in Norway provides indirect testimony of the courageous stand of Norwegian Christians against the "new order." It complains: "The fact that many theologians are still afraid to show sympathy for the new Norway is due to the mental terror which deplorably enough is carried on in Christian circles. That laymen may not go to Nazi pastors, or show themselves in company with Nazi Christians is due to the fact that anyone adopting the same attitude to Nazi members as to other mortals is persecuted and excluded. Whence comes this evil and what demon has struck Norwegian Christians blind? . . . Where are all the brilliant high-spirited preachers who gave us divine light and power? Have all Christian preachers who throw shadows on the developments ever reflected over the consequences? Gloomy homes with mothers complaining about rationing and fathers with a negative attitude to the New Order

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
HELEN LANE ROBERTS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

and naughty children in schools. . . . Today we find Christ's self-sacrificing and deeply earnest mind in those young Norwegians who fight in the legion risking their lives for us on the horrible Russian battlefield."

New Church Controversy in Norway

The conflict between the Church and the Nazis in Norway has reached a climax with the dismissal of the Primate of the Norwegian church, Bishop Berggrav, by the Nazi prime minister Major Quisling. The Government announced that henceforth he was to be treated only as a private person. In consequence of this action all the Bishops of the Norwegian church have resigned, declaring that "to cooperate with a State which uses violence against the Church would be to betray everything holy." The Bishops declared that though relinquishing their official functions they would "pursue their calling and exercise the authority they derive from their consecration," which is to say that they renounce all relations with political authority and claim only the religious authority of their office. Quisling insists, on the other hand, that if the Bishops resign they will not be allowed to preach anywhere in Norway.

The present crisis has its inception in scenes created by storm troopers in the Trondheim Cathedral on February 1st on the occasion of Quisling's assumption of office as prime minister. It is reported that all the ministers of the Norwegian church are supporting their Bishops. The Church has been for some time the chief thorn in the flesh of the Quisling government.

No Religious Conferences in Germany

The German government through its Church Department has informed all churches that church congresses and conventions which require the use of railroads will

no longer be permitted. Military use of the railways is given as the reason for the order, just as the banning of all church papers was justified by the shortage of paper. The faithful regard this restriction as merely one more effort on the part of the Government to destroy religion.

From Our Mail Bag

"I have noted in the issue of February 9, 1942 that you propose to publish a series of articles on Problems of Post-War Reconstruction. There obviously could be no objection to giving consideration to problems of this type, but my own view is that the present emphasis should be on winning the war. I think there is a positive danger of too much talk and discussion about what is going to happen after the war. I have serious question as to the advisability of embarking on such a series but that, of course, is something for your Board to determine."

James M. Brittain,
Philadelphia, Pa.

"The function of *Christianity and Crisis* as it appears to some of us is that of presenting to its readers not scholarly pieces of research or dissertations of technical theology but a report of the religious implications of current happenings. What we want to know from *Christianity and Crisis* is that religious thought, both commendable and condemnable, which comes directly from our experience in these crucial weeks. To put it specifically it is the desire of us in the field to be kept informed by the editors of the bearing of the Eternal on the all-too-present temporal."

Paul L. Garber,
Durham, N. C.

"On page 2 in the last paragraph of the first editorial in the issue of February 9th the writer says: 'In another sense it (love) means desire for, and earnest effort to promote, the welfare of another. In that sense it is possible to love one's enemies even when engaged in conflict with them.' Really I am astonished that such naïveté should find a place in the pages of *Christianity and Crisis*. I suspect that from the vantage point of an arm chair one might say such things, but do you suppose that the soldier who for an hour has been using his bayonet to rip open the bellies of his enemies would say it *or could say it*? If I know anything about human passions, such a statement is about as far from reality and is as good an illustration of wishful thinking as I have seen for many a day. . . . At least your editorials are disturbing—some fearfully so—and that is all to the good."

Edwin A. Brown,
Cincinnati, Ohio

Author in this Issue

Mr. Eugene Kohn is Managing Editor of the Jewish bi-weekly journal, "The Reconstructionist."

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 1-43